UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/584,853	06/28/2006	Matteo Cherchi	10880.0404	7887
22852 7590 08/03/2010 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP			EXAMINER	
			RAHLL, JERRY T	
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2874	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/03/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/584,853	CHERCHI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	JERRY T. RAHLL	2874			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with	n the correspondence address			
• •	V IS SET TO EVOIDE 2 MC	MITU(S) OD TUIDTY (20) DAVS			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ID. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC. .136(a). In no event, however, may a report will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT te, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. Jly be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 i	May 2010.				
,— · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>11-20</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>11-19</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) <u>20</u> is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	ner.				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>28 June 2006</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre		, ,			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 					
<u> </u>		·			
 Copies of the certified copies of the pricapplication from the International Burea 	•	eceived in this National Stage			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis		eceived.			
	- -				
Attachment(s)	_				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		mmary (PTO-413) /Mail Date			
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		ormal Patent Application			

Art Unit: 2874

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see "REMARKS", filed 14 May 2010, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 11-19 in view of US Patent No. 6,396,984 to Cho et al. have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of US Patent Application Publication 2002/0118916 to Lee et al., cited in Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement received 28 June 2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by S Patent Application Publication 2002/0118916 to Lee et al.
- 4. Regarding Claim 11, Lee describes an optical mode converter (Fig 1) comprising a coupling waveguide (102) having at an input end a first effective refractive index, the coupling waveguide comprising a tapered core (108) of a substantially constant refractive index (n1) with a substantially square cross section (Fig 3) at the input end having a size that tapers down moving away form the input end, the coupling waveguide having a cladding (106) at least partially surrounding the tapered core; and a receiving waveguide (104) having a second effective refractive index at an output end, comprising a core of a substantially constant

Art Unit: 2874

refractive index (n2) greater than the refractive index of the tapered core of the coupling waveguide ([0029]), and a cladding (106) at least partially surrounding the core, a side surface of the tapered core of the coupling waveguide being optically in contact (Fig 5A), in a coupling portion thereof (112), with the receiving waveguide so as to allow optical coupling between the coupling waveguide and the receiving waveguide.

- 5. Regarding the further limitations of Claim 11 and the limitations of Claims 12-14 and 16, Lee is silent as to the relative refractive indices of the waveguides. However, when the structure recited in the reference is substantially identical to that of the claims, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent (see MPEP § 2112.01). As discussed above, Lee describes the claimed mode converter structure. Therefore, the claimed relative refractive index properties are presumed to be inherent.
- 6. Regarding Claim 15, Lee describes the core of the receiving waveguide is tapered over at least a portion that is optically in contact with the coupling portion of the coupling waveguide (Fig 1).
- 7. Regarding Claims 17 and 18, Cho describes and a launching single mode optical fiber waveguide coupled to an input end of said coupling waveguide ([0013], [0037]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2874

9. Claim 19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US Patent No. 6,396,984 to Cho et al.

10. Claim 19 is essentially a method of forming the above-described optical mode converter. As discussed above, Lee describes the structure of the mode converter. Lee is silent as to the steps used to create the structure. However, the claimed steps of Claim 19 are well-known in the art, as exemplified by the disclosure of Cho (see Figs 7a-7g). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the well-known steps to make the structure described by Lee. The motivation for doing so would have been to create the device of Lee using commonly known tools.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 11. Claim 20 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 12. Claim 20 describes a step of growing a ridge on the top of the cladding layer. This is subject matter not described or reasonably suggested, in conjunction with the further limitations of the present claims, by the prior art of record.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JERRY T. RAHLL whose telephone number is (571)272-2356. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W-Sa (8:00-4:30).

Art Unit: 2874

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Uyen-Chau Le can be reached on 571-272-2397. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jerry T Rahll/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2874